

REMARKS

Claims 23-42 are now pending in the application. Claims 1-22 are cancelled. Claims 23-42 are new. Support for the new claims can be found throughout the written description, claims, and drawings as originally filed, as discussed in more detail below. Therefore, no new matter has been added. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claim 19 stands objected to by the Examiner. This objection is respectfully traversed. Notwithstanding, Claim 19 is cancelled. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1-4, 6-17, 19-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly not being directed to statutory subject matter. These rejections are respectfully traversed. Notwithstanding, Claims 1-4, 6-17, 19-22 are cancelled. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-4, 6, 17, 19-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 4,977,529 ("Gregg"). These rejections are respectfully traversed. Notwithstanding, Claims 1-4, 6, 17, 19-21 are cancelled. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gregg in view of U.S. Pat. No. 4,480,480 ("Scott"). Claims 8-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gregg in view of Scott, and further in view of U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0161533 ("Uegaki"). Claim 22 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gregg in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,670,908 ("Wilson"). These rejections are respectfully traversed. Notwithstanding, Claims 7-16 and 22 are cancelled. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

NEW CLAIMS

Applicant submits that the new claims define over the art of record. In addition, Applicant notes that support for the new claims may be provided through express, implicit, or inherent disclosure (see MPEP § 2163(I)(B)), and Applicant submits that the new claims are supported at least inherently, if not expressly or implicitly. For example, the new claims recite using a memory, a microprocessor, and an electronic display. The specification indicates that a system (and thereby a method) according to the present disclosure may use a variety of devices such as a computer on-board a vehicle, a cell phone, touchscreens, desktop computers, and notebook computers (see, e.g., paras. 19 and 28). Applicant notes that most, if not all, of these devices include a memory, a microprocessor, and an electronic display. Applicant also submits that a device capable of performing the steps of the methods recited in the new claims and supported by the present disclosure inherently includes a memory, a microprocessor, and an electronic display.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 17, 2012

By: Timothy J. Martin
Timothy J. Martin
Reg. No. 65,044

Kevin G. Mierzwa
Reg. No. 38,049

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

KGM/TJM/sms

16482095.1